

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

NEIL ANAND	:	CIVIL ACTION
<i>Plaintiff,</i>	:	
	:	
v.	:	No. 20-6246
	:	
INDEPENDENCE BLUE CROSS	:	
<i>Defendant.</i>	:	

MEMORANDUM

Brizuela’s second attempt to intervene in this case is without factual or legal foundation. Intervention is required for those who claim an interest relating to the subject of the action and are so situated that disposing of the action may impair or impede the movant’s ability to protect their interests. Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a). Intervention is permitted for those who have a claim or defense that shares a common question of law or fact with the main action. Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(b). In this case, Plaintiff Anand asserts thirty-four claims against Defendant Independence Blue Cross, all of which are premised on factual allegations specific to Plaintiff’s individual experiences. ECF No. 57. Brizuela does nothing to link his allegations, which relate to a purported nationwide scheme perpetuated by Defendants, with the claims raised by Plaintiff. At most, Brizuela points to Plaintiff as a victim of the alleged scheme. ECF No. 64 at 3. However, Brizuela does not argue that disposition of Plaintiff’s case will in any way impact the claims he seeks to assert or impede his ability to litigate his own interests.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Chad F. Kenney

CHAD F. KENNEY, JUDGE